DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 387 FL 025 568

AUTHOR	McNeely, Sharon
TITLE	Chapter One Special Alternative Summer School Project Evaluation, 1997-1998. Cicero Public Schools, District #99.
SPONS AGENCY	Cicero Board of Education, IL.
PUB DATE	1998-07-00
NOTE	41p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*English (Second Language); Family Literacy; Grade 4; Grade 5; Grade 6; Intermediate Grades; *Language Skills; Language Teachers; *Limited English Speaking; Mathematics Education; *Numeracy; Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Science Education; *Scientific Literacy; Skill Development; Staff Development; *Summer Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Cicero School District 99 IL; Education consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

The report evaluates the sixth year of an Illinois Chapter One Special Alternative Instructional Program for limited-English-proficient (LEP) students entering grades 4-6, designed to develop students' English language skills and academic skills in mathematics and science, increase professional development opportunities and instructional repertoires of teachers of LEP students, and enhance parent participation and literacy skills. The project was successful in meeting its major goal of serving the target population's needs; literacy, math, science, and computer skills all increased, and teacher and parent objectives were met. The report describes the program's design and funding, teacher development activities, parent activities, development of materials for parents to use with students, program administration, and presents the evaluation's findings. Nine specific recommendations are made for future program improvement and development. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FL

CICERO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DISTRICT #99

ED 430 387

CHAPTER ONE
SPECIAL ALTERNATIVE
SUMMER SCHOOL PROJECT

PROJECT EVALUATION
1997-1998

SHARON McNEELY, Ph.D.
EVALUATOR,
PROFESSOR
NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

FL025568

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sharon McNeely

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This document was created by Sharon McNeely, Ph.D., Professor of Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, Illinois 60625, as an independent contractor with the Cicero Public Schools. In this capacity, Dr. McNeely served as the external evaluator for the Chapter One Special Alternative Summer School: Literacy in Math and Science, Year VI. The report is the responsibility of the evaluator.

The report could not have been completed without the continued support and input from Barbara Kohot and Cindy Mosca of the Cicero Public Schools. They were responsible for providing historical information and statistical data related to the background and project development parts of this report. They were responsible for the continuation of this project. They were not responsible for data developed by the author related to the actual evaluation's methodology and analysis.

Any subsequent modification or use of the report and its data will be allowed only by written permission of both Cicero Public Schools Chapter One Director, Barbara Kohot, and the report author, Sharon McNeely.

The evaluator expresses her appreciation to the teachers, staff, parents, students, pre-service teachers, and summer school volunteers involved in this project. They have all willingly given of much time and energy to cooperate with the evaluation process. Without them, this evaluation report would not be possible.

Executive Summary

This document presents the evaluation results for Cicero Public School District #99 of Illinois Chapter One Special Alternative Instructional Program for the 1997-1998 school year. This is the sixth year of funding and implementation of this project. The initial three years were funded under Title VII funds. Cicero Public Schools district agreed to continue this special project which provides summer school with emphasis in building literacy through the use of mathematics and science using Chapter One funds for the fourth, fifth, and sixth year. In the course of this evaluation, several on-site visits were conducted by the external evaluator and many pieces of additional data, both quantitative and qualitative, were collected and analyzed.

This Project was designed to increase literacy development for students who have achieved some oral proficiency in English, and therefore are designated Limited English Proficient (LEP). The summer school has the dual purpose of developing the students' English skills and their academic skills in the areas of math and science. As a part of the overall design, there was also an intent to increase the professional development opportunities and instructional repertoires of teachers of limited English proficient students. There also was a goal to involve parents in the education of their children, and provide some literacy training and develop some materials for parents to use to interact with their children.

This evaluation demonstrates that the project was successful in meeting its major goal of serving the needs of the targeted LEP student group. The data indicate that literacy skills, science skills, math skills, and computer skills all increased. In addition, the data support that the teachers increased their instructional repertoires and participated in professional development opportunities. The data also support that many of the parents became involved with the education of their children, received literacy training, and used materials to interact with their children.

This executive summary includes a review of activities undertaken as part of this grant, a review of the implementation of the project, and a review of the evaluation methodology. The major findings of the evaluator are presented. In addition, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made.

The summer school project worked with students entering into grades four through six, the grades during which students traditionally transition from the bilingual or ESL programs into the regular classrooms. The project provided literacy development integrated with thematic mathematics and science instruction. It also provided support for students to learn computer and social skills, to aid in their successful transition into the mainstream classroom. The project also coincided with the general goals of Title VII, the national education goals, and the state of Illinois learning goals.

The funds provided under this project were limited, and did not begin to cover the many expenses which were part of the project. It is commendable that the Cicero Public Schools remained committed to not only meeting the project's specific objectives, but also to meeting its bigger, general goals. To that end, teachers and parents have received ongoing training and support from the District. Part of this training has involved application of the Teaching Integrated Math and Science (TIMS) program in the classroom, teaming, cooperative learning, effective lesson planning, human relations, and conflict management. In addition, many teachers have taken advantage of the District's professional development reimbursement plan which provides partial reimbursement for teachers who attend external professional development activities, such as graduate classes, continuing education workshops, etc. This reimbursement policy has also helped the district in that several teachers have been able to use this to complete ESL or bilingual certification programs.

The training provided directly through the district, and through the reimbursement policy of the district has benefited the project by providing an ample number of teachers who are well-

qualified for meeting the needs of students during summer school instruction. There were many more teachers who applied to teach this year than there were slots for teachers. This resulted in the Director being able to choose teachers for the project based on the teachers' qualifications.

The teachers were successful in meeting with each other and the curriculum consultant and jointly preparing booklets of strategies and activities that integrated literacy with math and science. These booklets are available for all teachers in the district to use with LEP students in mainstream classrooms. In addition, the summer school parent staff provided workshops for parents and developed materials for parents to use with their children at home. While these materials were designed to integrate math and science with literacy, they also met the needs of a number of parents in providing them with further training in their own use of basic English skills, math skills, and science concepts.

The strategies and activities developed by the teachers proved to be successful in developing further English competency in reading and writing among summer school program participants. The students showed a gain in not only their English written and comprehension competencies, but also in their use of various math and science related processes and vocabulary.

Prior project evaluators have provided recommendations that also apply here. In addition, other recommendations are made based on the assumption that the District will be applying for future funding and developing similar programs. The recommendations are:

1) Future summer school programs need to have a school location which is central in the district, and which meets the needs of students, staff, and parents. Special consideration needs to be given to not only availability for the students, but to the availability of a computer network, the Internet, the neighborhood resources, and the usability of the school during the summer. To maximize the program, resources should not be shared with other summer programs.

2) Future school programs need to balance employment of the staff, balancing employment by hiring those who may be familiar with various components of teaching summer school, and also employing others who have skills in needed areas. Only one quarter of the teaching staff who have previously been employed in this program should be re-hired in future years. All teachers should know how to integrate technology into their lessons. New teachers are needed each year to continue to not only meet professional development needs, but also to best serve the children with the development and implementation of new curriculum. Meanwhile, to insure the effective running of the program, the administrative team should be rehired in its entirety.
3) The district needs to review the salaries paid to the summer school staff, and make adjustments for the additional work required for this program.
4) The training aspect of the summer school program continues to need some modifications. There are needs to provide more inservice for new teachers, and different inservices to meet the needs of those teachers who have been with the program previously.
5) The high level of parent involvement needs to continue in future programs.
6) The use of classroom aides should be expanded and continued in future program.
7) The district should continue to use preservice teachers to further expand the supportive services provided to students and parents.
8) Future programs should continue the use of an administrative team for program development and implementation.
9) The materials used to solicit participation and for parent sign-up need further revision. A summer school brochure should be developed that explains the program, and the commitment required.

This year's summer school's building location was in the northern part of the city. It was convenient for most of the students and some of the parents. It was air-conditioned, and had room for the curriculum implementation. However, the building also housed the special education program, which resulted in teachers having to change and schedule events around the special education session's use of facilities. This often meant that teachers could not leave rooms set-up for various events, and had to work around room use. The school building also did not have an internal network for the computers, nor did it have Internet access. This limited some aspects of computer integration into the curriculum. Additionally, in general, there were few city resources nearby that the students could access.

The earlier project evaluators had also recommended that the professional staff be re-employed. In year six, about one-half of the staff had previous program experience. Programatically, this allowed new staff to be trained by old staff, and allowed for some program consistency while bringing in new ideas and also providing for some new training that was not previously given to staff. Overall, the combination of experience with new staff was probably one of the reasons that the program continued to be successful.

The district has traditionally paid the teachers based on the hours of inservice, and the hours of time expected to be at the program. The reality is that there are many additional hours that the teachers put in in developing their curriculum, meeting in their teams, meeting on their committees, preparing for parent nights, preparing assessments, writing journals, etc. The teachers report that the pay has not been increased in the past few years. Normal increases in pay and pay for the time involved should be included in future funding of the program.

Input from the previous teachers, review of developed curriculum materials, and the evaluation processes used in the past previously lead to the recommendation that the training process for the teachers needs some minor modifications in future programs. This past year a

staff training plan was put in place and followed to some extent. In the future, it is recommended that a plan again be developed and used.

Previous project evaluators had also recommended that the high level of parent involvement continue. The project continued to have parents involved by having them be teaching assistants, and by having them actively training other parents. This year, the project also had parents who were hired to serve as teaching assistants that were specially trained to teach other parents how to develop math and science activities at home. These teaching assistant/trainers hosted sessions for parents to be trained. These sessions, held during the day, drew about 5% of the summer school parents to each session. The project also had parent involvement at two special parent night activities associated with summer school. The two parent nights drew about 30% of the parents to the school location. Parents participated in activities related to math and science, and also some group socialization events.

Similar to previous years, some of the parents and staff developed an integrated literacy, math, and science booklet for use at home. The booklet was done in dual language, and offered pictures, clearly labeled sequenced activities, etc. The evaluator also continues the recommendation made in prior years, that future programs have as a component the development of materials for the home. These materials should provide strategies for parents and students to positively interact with each other and with the school while building literacy skills.

Previously, both parents and university pre-service teachers were used as aides in some classrooms. This year, the use of pre-service teachers was expanded. The feedback from teachers was that these additional classroom helpers were very important for the program. The evaluator recommends that future programs continue to use university pre-service teachers as aides.

This year the summer school used an administrative team approach to running the school. One team member was in charge of overseeing curriculum development and implementation. One team members was in charge of overseeing and coordinating the use of aides, pre-service

teachers, guests, parent activities, etc. One team member served as the principal/director and oversaw other aspects of the summer school. This approach worked well, but some fine-tuning is needed. The evaluator recommends that future programs continue to use an administrative team approach to running the school.

The summer school program had a hard time attracting and keeping the number of students that it was designed to serve. The summer school program would benefit from a resign of the materials that parents read to understand the program. The program could also use a brochure that explains the various parts of the program and the commitment that parents should make to the program.

This final evaluation report includes information about the design and implementation of this Title VII project, and is divided into seven sections which include:

1. Historical Overview
2. Program Description
3. Evaluation Methodology/Data Analysis for Year Six
4. Results for Year Six
5. Conclusions for Year Six and Recommendations for Future Years
6. Appendices

Historical Overview

Since 1976, Illinois had mandated bilingual education for limited English proficient children. Schools which enrolled 20 or more children of one language background have been mandated to provide appropriate services in a transitional bilingual education program. In 1985, as part of the School Reform Act, the statute required that all children of limited English proficiency be provided special educational services to meet their linguistic needs. As a result of this mandate, demographic shifts in the population, and new methods of determining bilingual program eligibility, the number of students eligible to receive these services has grown enormously.

The Cicero Public Schools are located in Cook County, Illinois. This district, District #99, is an urban-like suburb of Chicago. The students face the problems of gangs, drugs, and violence. They also face the issues of ethnic migration and centration which has resulted in enclaves of various ethnic groups developing. In Cicero, these enclaves allow students to have the richness of their native cultures, but also minimize the need to learn and use English. The District attempts to deal with these concerns by providing bilingual education services, and services which are designed to make students feel safer.

District #99's bilingual program has grown each year it has been in existence. The program currently serves an estimated 4,730 students who are of limited English proficiency. The growth in this program has varied yearly, but has always been growth. This number currently represents about 44% of the total student population of 10,802. The current student population consists of students from at least 20 major language groups. The varieties of programs and services provided is also growing, with over 100 teachers and other employees now serving the LEP students in the district.

District #99 has been pressed to serve the LEP students. It is a unique district. It serves only .45% of the total school population in the state, but about 4% of the state's total LEP

population. The bilingual program is now the second largest in the state. This is compounded by the fact that about 65% of the students in the district are categorized as from low-income families.

As the district sought to deal with its growth in LEP students, a Title VII project director was hired, and a comprehensive plan was developed to deal with the growth. A Title VII Special Alternative Grant was applied for, and received by the district. This grant sought to specifically meet some of the needs of the students through a summer school project. Over three years, the project was successful. This was the third year beyond the grant that the district committed Chapter One funds to continue to meet the original grant's goals relative to the summer school project. The focus of the grant was to meet objectives in three areas, instruction, materials development, and training. The grant was successful, and this year the previous objectives were again applied.

Program Description

District #99's pay scale for teachers is below the average of other suburban area districts, and is below the average found in Chicago Public Schools. As a result, Cicero has a difficult time attracting and keeping teaching staff. The teaching experience of the staff served by this project is about five years.

The Cicero school district does not have an exact count of parents that are LEP or bilingual. It is known that there are many more parents than are represented by the counts in the schools. Even though many of the LEP and bilingual students move on to the regular education services in a timely manner, that does not mean that their parents are gaining any English skills of their own. This project sought to serve parents by providing them training and supportive workshops. The project served over 300 parents through various workshops and training services.

Staff training was provided on both a one-to-one consultation basis and in small groups. The small group training emphasized methods teachers could use to develop curriculum and implement it in a way to develop language and literacy skills in math and science and in using the computer in the classroom.

This project was an intensive summer school program. This program was staffed by 19 teachers, 5 staff, three administrative team members, and one program director who serviced a total of 201 students of the 900+ students in grades 4-6. These parents of these students were also serviced in various ways by the program.

Staff for the summer school program participated in intensive training prior to the start of the program. The training focused on developing the staff to work on integrating computers in the classroom, and to develop curriculum. The staff was required to develop a variety of written materials as part of their training. These materials serve as further documentation as to the program's effectiveness, and are presented later.

The focus of the Summer School Program was to develop language skills in LEP and bilingual students. All students were selected for the program based on their test scores in the use of English, and based on teacher recommendation of need. The program sought to teach language skills through an integrated curricular/team approach. The staff worked in teams to develop and implement curriculum which was based on the Teaching Integrated Math and Science (TIMS) program developed by the University of Illinois at Chicago. The curriculum implementation also had to use cooperative learning, sheltered English instruction, and individualization where possible. The staff coordinated their curriculum development and instructional planning so that team members knew what other members of their team were doing, and students, who worked with all team members, were exposed to a variety of instructional strategies and learning designs. The purpose of this complex, integrated program was to help students continue their English language development while learning math and science and transition into regular education classes.

The 1997-1998 school year was the sixth year of the project related to language in math and science. The specific project instructional objectives were:

1. In the area of English, students will demonstrate a pre/post gain of at least 25% in English competency in reading and writing (herein called Objective #1).
2. In the area of Math/Science, using a portfolio and performance-based assessment, students will demonstrate a working knowledge of the following math/science processes: measuring, predicting (estimating), data collecting, graphing, extrapolating (from graph), interpolating (from graph) (herein called Objective #2).

Another part of this project included materials development objectives. These objectives included:

1. Summer school staff will prepare a booklet of strategies and activities for integrating the instruction of language, math, and science for LEP students in mainstream classrooms (herein called Objective #3).

2. Summer school parent staff will prepare a booklet of strategies and activities integrating language, science, and math to be used by parents with their children (herein called Objective #4).

Training was integral for materials development. The training objectives included:

1. Summer school staff will demonstrate increased levels of use of successful approaches and strategies for teaching LEP students language through the integration of math and science (herein called Objective #5).

2. Summer school parent staff will demonstrate an increased knowledge of ways in which to foster language development through math and science integration (herein called Objective #6).

3. Summer school parent staff will provide inservice for district parent groups in family activities integrating language, math and science (herein called Objective #7).

Teachers unfamiliar with the specific aspects of curriculum development related to the grant were minimally trained for this materials development. Teachers worked on teams prior to and at the beginning of the summer school to develop the curriculum.

The project stipulated that when curriculum materials were developed, booklets would be developed in a structure that would allow for additional materials to be added later. To meet this end, developed materials were grouped by team and theme into binders.

The materials development aspect also included that staff be provided professional training. Staff were given opportunities to attend other training, and were given a variety of other materials for development over the course of the project.

Applying previously successful strategies, and after working with the curriculum consultants, and attending various trainings, a portion of the staff helped in the development of the criteria for portfolio assessment, anecdotal records assessment, and other assessments.

The further tasks of the implementation of the objectives were accomplished per the timetable. The consultants were notified and hired. Parents were identified and hired. Students were selected and notified. An administrative team was hired for the summer school. The teachers were inserviced on the previous grant and were involved in the development of specific objectives for the curriculum under this part of the grant.

Evaluation Methodology/Data Analysis for Year Six

The evaluation of the Cicero School District Chapter One Summer School Project has been designed to assess the extent to which the pre-established goals and objectives of the project were met. The external evaluation included structured interviews, observations, questionnaires, surveys, portfolio assessment, review of video tapes, review of journals, review of logs, and analysis of primary and secondary quantitative data. This qualitative and quantitative data was used to determine the degree to which the program successfully met its proposed objectives. The section in this report on results includes information as to the actual attainment of the outcomes.

This evaluator had served as the curriculum development consultant for all six years of the grant, and as the evaluator for the second through sixth years. The consultant was aware of all project aspects, and was involved with the project on an on-going basis. This perspective allowed the evaluator to have access to materials and obtain information that a superficial evaluator would not have obtained. The result was a great deal of data, with the relevant information included in this analysis.

The various objectives of the program required various methods for assessment. In an effort to efficiently discuss these objectives as they related to the evaluation methodology, the objectives presented above were re-numbered in sequential fashion so that the instructional objectives remained objectives one and two. The materials development objectives became three and four. The training objectives became objectives five, six, and seven.

The summer school program was scheduled for six weeks. This was too short of a time for the use of larger standardized achievement measures to be reliably used to pre-and post-test student achievement and not compromise validity. To meet the program's objectives, locally-derived measures provided a valid alternative for assessment. These measures had been used to

some degree in prior years, and were designed to coordinate with the on-going portfolio-based assessment that is used within the district.

The students were bussed to the summer school location, Liberty School The bus drivers' salaries, and the costs for bussing were paid for by District #99 funds. The District also paid all related bussing costs for providing buses for two nights for the parent programs. Liberty School is located in the northern part of the district. It is a secured facility, and was accessible to the students. There was adequate space for each teacher to have his/her own room. There was a room allocated for computer-related teachers to operate from. Computers were brought in from the district for the summer school and were dispersed so that all teams had computer in their classrooms. The building had an elevator that allowed students and faculty accessibility. There was space for students to play and work on projects in the hallways and in front of the school. Teachers reported that the only draw-backs to the building were the lack of nearby community resources, the lack of a networked computer system and Internet access, and the sharing of some major rooms (such as the gym and the teacher preparation area) with the special education summer school.

The summary of the post-program teacher survey results are presented in Attachment #1 of the appendices. The teacher survey was prepared as a means for teachers to provide qualitative data and commentary about the program. It was given to each teacher after summer school ended, with an envelope to return it directly to the evaluator. To try to insure honesty, teachers were informed that although their responses would be part of the evaluation process, their confidentiality would be maintained. Teachers not only provided general thoughts about the program, but also specific comments and recommendations.

The first two objectives were measured through the various items produced by students that were found in their portfolios. There were a total of 201 students involved in the complete summer school program. Initially, several of the students accepted to the program did not attend,

and others were added through the first week. During the six weeks of summer school, attendance dropped by almost 20%. The administrative team tried to follow-up on non-attendees and to ascertain why they did not come or why they left early. The majority of the parents reported that they had decided to go on vacation early and had to leave to go to Mexico for the rest of the summer. Some parents had family problems that resulted in having the child removed from the program. Some parents reported that the gang problems in Cicero which resulted in the children being sent to live with relatives outside of the district. Unlike previous summers, a number of the parents did come to the schools and requested their children's portfolios when they took their children out early.

Students were assigned to a team of teachers who prepared and implemented the curriculum. At the end of the summer school, all students' portfolios were collected, and analyzed. Those students who had attended at least 90% of the program and had completed pre and post assessments were included in the overall analysis. This was a usually a total of 158 students.

All teachers were assigned to a teaching team and to a particular component of the program. The teachers who worked on the assessment component met with the evaluator to determine what ways the objectives might be assessed, and the overall curriculum assessed. This committee developed a packet of assessment procedures. Many of these procedures were available through various publications concerning curriculum and alternative assessment. Other procedures were developed in-house. The SAG Project teachers all received training in using the assessments, and a schedule was developed for completion of each of the components. The administrative team took on the specific task of making sure pre-assessments were completed for the students enrolling after the first three days of summer school.

There were different pre-tests designed to assess student skills in literacy, writing, math, and science. These were also used in the same or an alternative form as post-assessments.

Additionally, all students completed an assessment that involved a journal, and an additional writing. Also, depending on the specific curriculum, some students also completed other assessments. If these were relevant to the objectives, they were included in the analysis.

Objective #1 was that students will demonstrate a pre/post gain of at least 25% in English competency in reading and writing. English competency gains were assessed via student writing samples and the use of a cloze worksheet related to math and science vocabulary normally found in the third through sixth grades. For this evaluation, the mean score of the number of correct items pre-and post- was compared. The students also completed a pre-assessment in which they participated in an integrated math and science activity. A different activity that had the same assessment component was used for post-assessment. The scores of the correct responses for the activity work were compared, and the writing each student did as part of the assessments was analyzed. The number of words produced in English by the students was also counted, as were spelling errors. All assessments were developed in consultation with an English-language specialist professor at the evaluator's university.

Objective #1 also related to increased reading competency. This was not directly assessed during the summer school. However, some indirect assessments were made. First, all students kept a book log in their portfolios. Whenever they read a book, they were asked to add this to their log. The teachers monitored this, and reminded students that parents would be looking at the logs during the parent nights, etc. For this evaluation, the number of books the students read during the six weeks was counted. Second, all students kept a journal over the course of summer school. The students wrote in their journals, and the teachers read these, wrote comments, and were instructed to ask written questions back to the students. The students had to read the teacher's written comments and questions and determine if they would respond to these. The evaluator counted the number of journal entries made by the students as well as the number of teacher entries in the student journals. The number of words produced in the first, and in the last

entries were counted and compared. Also, random entries were sampled for their use of math and science vocabulary.

Objective #2 was that using a portfolio and performance-based assessment, students will demonstrate a working knowledge of the following math/science processes: measuring, predicting (estimating), data collecting, graphing, extrapolating (from graph), interpolating (from graph). The integrated math and science activities used for pre- and post-assessment which are described above were also used for this objective. Comparison of pre- and post- mean scores was used to show students' gain in knowledge.

Objective #3 was related to the development of materials. It stated that summer school staff will prepare a booklet of strategies and activities for integrating the instruction of language, math, and science for LEP students in mainstream classrooms. The four teaching teams each developed their own units to meet the mission statement, goals, and objectives of the program. At the start of the teacher training in the spring of 1998, the teachers were inserviced about the project and the previous summer schools. The teachers reviewed the prior mission statement, goals, and objectives, and agreed to keep the mission statement and goals, and make some changes in the objectives. The Mission Statement was: The literacy in Math/Science Summer Program will encourage students to take an active role in an interactive, ever-changing environment where trust and empowerment are the building blocks for learning. The two program goals were: 1) Students will be encouraged to develop literacy, decision making, and problem solving skills by sharing experiences and using discovery strategies in math, science, and language arts; and, 2) Students will discover and experience their learning strengths through processes involving team teaching, parent partnerships and interactive student participation. The objectives that they agree to meet at least twice in their units across the curriculum were: "At the end of our summer program:

1. Students will read for different purposes.

2. Students will express written ideas, incorporating new vocabulary using standard English, in a clear, organized manner through the writing process.
3. Students will use self-evaluative techniques as appropriate.
4. Students will organize, interpret, and label data correctly to solve problems in math, science, and language arts.
5. Students will participated in cooperative group activities with peers, parents, and other adults.
6. Students will follow verbal and written directions.
7. Students will express ideas in comprehensible English.
8. Students will use technology as appropriate.

The extent to which Objective #3 of the project was met was directly measured through observing the completed, bound materials the teachers developed. Each of the objectives had to be covered at least twice in each unit. The extent to which the objectives were covered was analyzed. The intent of this evaluation was not to assess the extent to which each of the curriculum objectives were met. However, the portfolios did allow for that assessment, and some general checks were made to insure that the written curriculum objectives were being met.

Grant Objective #4 was that summer school parent staff will prepare a booklet of strategies and activities integrating language, science, and math to be used by parents with their children. The summer school parent staff worked with the teachers and produced a booklet of several activities for parents. The parent staff also hosted two different family nights for the students and their families to interact with the teachers in a variety of science and math activities. The parent staff also conducted day-time workshops for parents. The evaluator read the activity booklet, reviewed the reports and videotapes of family nights. Additionally, the summer school parent staff completed an open-ended survey at the end of the summer school.

Objective #5 of the project was related to training. It was that summer school staff will demonstrate increased levels of use of successful approaches and strategies for teaching LEP students language through the integration of math and science. This objective was measured in various ways. First, the materials the teachers developed and used for their units of instruction were assessed. The number and kind of activities was compiled. This was compared to the information that the teachers provided on the first day of the training in which they described their current practices. Second, the integration of math and science was assessed for each unit. Third, the teachers completed a journal throughout their summer school experience. The journals were turned in weekly to one of the administrative team of the summer school program who wrote comments and tried to deal with specific requests of teachers. The journals were analyzed by the evaluator to determine that teachers had become more aware of teaching strategies through their reports of what they had learned from professional development activities.

Following the completion of summer school, teachers also completed a detailed evaluation of the overall project. The successful completion of objective #5 is also indirectly assessed within the questionnaire (attachment #1). The subjective, qualitative information obtained was collated by the evaluator.

Objective #6 was that summer school parent staff will demonstrate an increased knowledge of ways in which to foster language development through math and science integration. Parent staff completed their materials development and trained parents. The evaluator considered that if the parents felt that they had been successfully trained, the parent staff had demonstrated increased knowledge in fostering language development. The evaluator used a parent interview to assess this.

Objective #7 was that summer school parent staff would provide inservices to district parent groups. The evaluator collected information about the trainings and observed the videos to ascertain if this was done.

Results of Year Six

The results will be presented as they relate to each Chapter One Summer School Project objective. Further information deemed important to the program will be presented after the specific objectives' results are presented.

In part, a series of one-way and two-way analysis of variance was used to assess how well Objective #1 was met. The results are presented in Table #1. As there were significant differences by gender, the table presents this information with the break-down.

TABLE #1: Student Pre-and Post-Literacy and Writing Mean Scores

	Pre- (Start)		Post- (End)		
Pre/post					
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Sign.
Free write number words written in English	40.0	52.7	75.1	90.0	$p<.01$
Cloze activity	17.5	18.5	19.5	19.3	$p<.05$
Number of words produced in journal entry	45.9	62.6	47.1	60.0	
Computer use	4.5	3.8	6.5	6.2	$p<.01$

For Objective #1, ANOVA was conducted to compare the pre- and post- assessment mean scores for differences. With the exception of the journal entries, there was a significant difference at the $p>.05$ or less level, with the mean score comparisons showing gains from the beginning to the end of summer school. The cloze procedures worksheet for use of English relative to math and science (in grades 4 through 6) results showed a difference increase of almost two words, which given word levels, was one grade level. The growth is also shown in the number of words produced in English on a timed situation in response to an open-ended writing prompt.

The analysis of the student book logs found that those students who completed the program over the six weeks read a total of 2,116 books. The boys averaged 11.4 books, and the girls averaged 16.4 books each. The student journal analysis found that students wrote an average of 17.9 different times. The teachers responded an average of 16.5 different times.

Computers were placed with each team. The teachers were minimally trained to use them, and were required to have technology linkages in their lessons. Two teams of teachers fully integrted the computers, and students learned to use them, the digital cameras, and to write electronic books. The other two teams did not achieve full integration. In one team, students reported only using the computers to play games, and there were no computer-related products found in the students' portfolios. In the other team, the teachers reported that they tried to send the students to the computer teachers, and actually moved the computers from their classrooms. Despite these problems, all but one classroom of students learned the basic computer skills that were assessed. As these students have typically only had access to computers for a total of three hours each year, and most did not know anything beyond how to turn on the computer at the start of summer school, they made major progress in learning to use the computer. In all, it was determined that these results support that Objective #1 was met, with students increasing their English competency in reading and writing by at least 25%.

For Objective #2, the students' mean scores of the various TIMS assessments. The mean scores for the TIMS assessments are presented in Table #2. Again, as there were some differences by gender, the results are presented by gender.

Table #2: TIMS Checklist Results

	Pre- Mean Score		Post- Mean Score	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Graphing of experiment	.9	1.0	3.1	4.3
Data presentation of experiment	1.8	1.9	4.0	4.2

Correct completion of experiment questions .2 .1 .5 .4

For Objective #2, ANOVA was conducted to compare the pre- and post- assessment mean scores for differences. For each, there was a significant difference at the p>.001 level, with the mean score comparisons showing gains from the beginning to the end of summer school. The assessments used for Objective #2 indicated that the students did demonstrate a working knowledge of math and science processes including measuring, predicting, data collecting, graphing, extrapolating, and interpolating.

When the units were developed, the teachers were given the responsibility to insure that each of the objectives for the curriculum were covered at least twice across the units. The units were all bound for distribution to the schools in the District at the end of summer school. This process met Objective #3 of the Grant. However, the evaluator was also concerned that the students also had a chance to actually meet the objectives developed within the units, that is that there was evidence that the developed units were presented to the students. The students' portfolios were used to check that there was evidence of each unit's assessments in the portfolios of the students who should have been exposed to that unit. A check of all of the portfolios found 92% of them had the unit assessments. Therefore, it seems that Objective #3 was met in all the units.

Part of Objective #4 was met in that a Family Activities Booklet was developed and produced, and distributed by the parent staff working in cooperative with the teachers. The school staff made the decision to bind all of the various activities into one booklet, and to produce it with back-to-back English and Spanish for each activity. This allowed parents who had literacy to make use of it.

There were over 30 parents who participated in the parent training sponsored by the parent staff. Parents who responded to interviews indicated that they anticipated using the materials with their children, that the workshop was presented and organized well, and that they

wanted these sessions to be held during the regular school year. Overall, it was determined that Objective #4 was met, as a booklet of strategies was developed, and was made available to parents.

Objective #5 was assessed through different means. The first way was to compare the number and kind of activities found in the unit books last year to those that were developed this year. The curriculum development process that was used tried to insure that no units of last year were reused this year, and that new units were significantly different from previous years' units. The comparison found that no unit which was developed this year had activities that were similar to those found in a previously developed unit. The teachers did seem to be using other strategies, and incorporating things that they had learned through the staff development processes provided to the teachers. Additionally, all units developed this year also integrated technology. A technology link was found in each unit developed, although the product for that link was not present in all student portfolios.

The second way to assess Objective #5 was to look at the integration of math and science in each unit. Within all units, there were a variety of at least two math and two science concepts included in each unit.

Objectives #6 and #7 were assessed through the parent responses to interviews and through analysis of the videos. These were discussed earlier. The results indicated that the parent staff had demonstrated an increased knowledge in literacy, math, and science; and that the parent training had occurred at the district level.

Conclusions from Year Six and Recommendations for Future Programs

The results of the program data indicate that the program was successful, with students increasing their literacy in math and science, and in use of various math and science concepts. The teachers gained skills in integrating math and science with literacy in the curriculum, and in applying these in the classroom. The parent staff gained skills in knowledge and training, and the parents were provided various training experiences and materials.

The results do not speak to some of the other accomplishments of the program. One of these was the use of computers and calculators by the students, many of whom indicated that they had never or rarely worked with a computer prior to the summer school experience. It is important to note that due to the district's current technology arrangement, all students are bused three times a year to one of the district's computer labs where students spend about one hour on the computer. For many students, this was their first real contact with the computer. Another was the help and interest generated by the program. Parents started volunteering, preservice teachers put in their required hours and stayed for more hours. Others from the community volunteered or provided donations.

Time was allocated on Friday for the entire school to come together for a joint session The teachers organized their chosen theme of "Come Aboard: Learn by Exploring" into a topical approach in not only the classrooms but also the joint sessions. One teacher wrote a theme song and the students and teachers learned this. Students engaged in singing this on Friday, as well as participating in a variety of group activities which were organized by the teacher teams. Typically they all wore their school t-shirts that day, shirts that they had colored with the summer school theme. Many of these were video-taped, as were some class lessons. The spirit of "teaming" and sharing is evidenced many times, with the unstated goal of students being further socialized into our society being met.

The results of the project lead to some overall recommendations for future program. The prior project evaluators made some recommendations that this evaluator also recommends. In addition, other recommendations are made. The recommendations are:

1) Future summer school programs need to have a school location which is central in the district, and which meets the needs of students, staff, and parents. Special consideration needs to be given to not only availability for the students, but to the availability of a computer network, the Internet, the neighborhood resources, and the usability of the school during the summer. To maximize the program, resources should not be shared with other summer programs.
2) Future school programs need to balance employment of the staff, balancing employment by hiring those who may be familiar with various components of teaching summer school, and also employing others who have skills in needed areas. Only one quarter of the teaching staff who have previously been employed in this program should be re-hired in future years. All teachers should know how to integrate technology into their lessons. New teachers are needed each year to continue to not only meet professional development needs, but also to best serve the children with the development and implementation of new curriculum. Meanwhile, to insure the effective running of the program, the administrative team should be rehired in its entirety.
3) The district needs to review the salaries paid to the summer school staff, and make adjustments for the additional work required for this program.
4) The training aspect of the summer school program continues to need some modifications. There are needs to provide more inservice for new teachers, and different inservices to meet the needs of those teachers who have been with the program previously.
5) The high level of parent involvement needs to continue in future programs.
6) The use of classroom aides should be expanded and continued in future program.

7) The district should continue to use preservice teachers to further expand the supportive services provided to students and parents.
8) Future programs should continue the use of an administrative team for program development and implementation.
9) The materials used to solicit participation and for parent sign-up need further revision. A summer school brochure should be developed that explains the program, and the commitment required.

Recommendation 1: *Future summer school programs need to have a school location which is central in the district, and which meets the needs of students, staff, and parents. Special consideration needs to be given to not only availability for the students, but to the availability of a computer network, the Internet, the neighborhood resources, and the usability of the school during the summer. To maximize the program, resources should not be shared with other summer programs.*

The earlier evaluators had recommended that the site of the project be a central location. The current building was accessible, usable, and air conditioned. However, the trade-off was that the neighborhood was not one in which the students could walk around or access community resources. The building location should be weighed and the location discussed within district with the administrative team so that a joint decision can be made, if at all possible. Additionally, sharing the building space with the special education summer school proved to be somewhat problematic for the program. There was less space for teachers to do large group activities, and activity set-ups had to be taken down to accommodate the special education program. Overall, teachers reported that they had to do much more work for take down and re-set, lost learning time, and couldn't engage in some planned activities due to space problems. The additional consideration has to be for the computer integration. While computers were brought in from across the district for the summer school program and placed in classrooms, these computers had

to be used as stand-alones. The building lacked an internet network. There was no internet access. It is important for the program to include the integration of computer technology, but this should include a networked and Internet-access system.

Recommendation 2: *Future school programs need to balance employment of the staff, balancing employment by hiring those who may be familiar with various components of teaching summer school, and also employing others who have skills in needed areas. Only one quarter of the teaching staff who have previously been employed in this program should be re-hired in future years. All teachers should know how to integrate technology into their lessons. New teachers are needed each year to continue to not only meet professional development needs, but also to best serve the children with the development and implementation of new curriculum. Meanwhile, to insure the effective running of the program, the administrative team should be rehired in its entirety.*

The earlier project evaluations had also recommended that the professional staff be re-employed. This year, about one-half of the staff had previous program experience. Programatically, this allowed new staff to be trained by old staff, and allowed for some program consistency while bringing in new ideas and also providing for some new training that was not previously given to staff. Overall, the combination of experience with new staff was probably one of the reasons that the program was successful. However, for a new program, a concerted effort needs to be undertaken to hire teachers who do not typically get involved in such offerings, and new staff need to be notified of the opportunities and their chances to participate. For the future year, only about one quarter of the teachers who have previously been employed in this program should be re-hired. Additionally, this rehiring should be based on prior successful implementation of the program, and meeting the program objectives. There were three teachers whose students did not make significant progress during this summer program. In reviewing the work of these students and the units written, the teachers did not consistently focus on the learning objectives. These

teachers should not be rehired. All of these teachers were previously in the program. It may be that they have become burned-out or passe about the program. It may be that they didn't feel pressure to conform to the program the way other teachers did. Regardless, rehiring of the teachers needs to consider that they will be able to mentally meet the challenges of the program.

Additionally, about one half of the teachers had problems integrating the technology into their lessons. The program had hired three computer resource teachers to work with the teachers on integrating technology into the classroom. One of these teachers was extremely effective, and teachers who worked with this resource person showed true integration in their lessons and in their students' learning products. The other two computer resource teachers did not seem to truly grasp or implement the concept themselves, and did not seem able to help the classroom teachers effectively. Future programs do not need to employ three computer resource teachers. One person can be used for this position, resourcing with all the teachers, especially if the teachers who are employed are already knowledgeable about using technology and integrating it into their lessons.

The district also needs to find a way to insure that the teachers hired for the summer school have signed contracts to work with the district for at least the upcoming school year. This year several of the teachers were leaving the district for other jobs. They take the training and all of the learning to team, to integrate the math and science, etc., with them. One of the ideals of the program is to have the teachers go back in the fall and implement what they have learned in summer. The teachers cannot implement, mentor, or role model if they are no longer in the district.

The administrative team should be rehired, in their entirety if possible. The team knows the program and has developed several methods for helping keeping the program running effectively. Re-inventing the program would likely result in less student achievement and in less overall effectiveness.

Recommendation 3: *The district needs to review the salaries paid to the summer school staff, and make adjustments for the additional work required for this program.*

While the program is expensive, the teachers do a great deal of work for this program, and put in many hours during the spring and summer. Teachers should be paid at a rate higher than is currently provided, or at least at a rate that recognizes all of the hours that they put into the program. This would encourage more teachers to apply for the program, make the program more competitive among the district's good teachers, make the program competitive with the other summer employment available to the teachers, and make the program seem more valued by the district.

Recommendation 4: *The training aspect of the summer school program continues to need some modifications. There are needs to provide more inservice for new teachers, and different inservices to meet the needs of those teachers who have been with the program previously.*

Input from the teachers, and review of developed curriculum materials previously lead to the recommendation that the training process for the teachers needs modifications in future programs. This year a staff training plan was put in place and followed to some extent. However this year the training focused on the integration of technology, and did not match what the teachers needed. The teachers need time to learn to team, to collaborate, to develop the curriculum, to develop the thematic units, and to plan for all of the various committee work that is also part of the summer school process. An additional Saturday training needs to be added early in the program and time reduced for during summer school training. The pre-summer school training should generally follow previous patterns that have worked well, and should include:

1) introduction to the program, program components, and building team unity for the entire team;

2) choosing a theme for summer school, redeveloping and refining the learning objectives, overviews of sheltered instruction, processes for building literacy and integrating literacy, TIMS components and expectations;
3) integrating technology, developing [illegible]hemes within the larger themes, developing committees, developing curriculum;
4) curriculum development and resource planning and ordering, committee work;
5) committee work and reports, curriculum development and sharing among the teams.

Each one of these items should typically take one Saturday of five hours.

Additionally, the administrative team usually needs to meet several times. This team should have its own inservice prior to the start of the program, so it can be ready for the start of the teacher inservices.

Recommendation 5: *The high level of parent involvement needs to continue in future programs.* The previous project evaluations had also recommended that the high level of parent involvement continue. The project continued to have parents involved by having them be teaching assistants, and by having them actively training other parents. This year, the project also had parents who were hired to serve as teaching assistants that were specially trained to teach other parents how to develop math and science activities at home. These teaching assistant/trainers hosted sessions for parents to be trained. These sessions, held during the day, drew over 20 parents to each session. The project also had parent involvement at two special parent night activities associated with summer school. The two parent nights drew over 40% of the parents to the school location. Parents participated in providing feedback on their children's' portfolios of work, did their own literacy development project, and also participated in activities.

One of the scheduling problems encountered this year, that seemed to heavily impact the parent participation, could not be helped. The parent night was scheduled at the beginning of the program. However, there was an international soccer world play-off that involved Mexico's team

on the first parent night. Most students reported that day that parents would not be present because of the match. Attendance was much better for the second night when there was no conflicting soccer match.

Similar to previous years, some of the parents and staff developed an integrated literacy, math, and science booklet for use at home. The booklet was done in dual language, and offered pictures, clearly labeled sequenced activities, etc. The evaluator also continues the recommendation that future programs have as a component the development of materials for the home. These materials should provide strategies for parents and students to positively interact with each other and with the school while building literacy skills. An additional recommendation is added that any materials which are developed in booklet forms include a page which tells parents how to deal with violence, gang activities, and provides information about social services available to the students and to their parents. The nature of this grant meant that most students and most parents were not native-born, or had not lived in the United States for very long. During the course of the summer school, at least two students were known to have experienced some sort of problem at home that needed social services. In discussions with the parents, it was clear to members of the administrative team that the parents did not have knowledge of how to access social services for help the way that others who know the dominant language do. The school providing suggestions and resources may help save some students' lives down the line.

Recommendation 6: *The use of classroom aides should be expanded and continued in future programs.* The aides play a vital role in helping the classroom teacher and the students with the teaching-learning process. Teachers work for a few intense hours each day, and yet significant gains are made in student learning. Without the aides, the teachers would not be able to successfully complete many of their classroom activities. This next year, other should be encouraged to volunteer as aides, if they have the skills and knowledge required for the task.

Recommendation 7: *The district should continue to use preservice teachers to further expand the supportive services provided to students and parents.*

Previously, both parents and university pre-service teachers were used as aides in some classrooms. This year, the use of pre-service teachers was expanded. The feedback from teachers was that these additional classroom helpers were very important for the program. The evaluator feels that aides could be effectively trained and used for a variety of supportive projects with the students. The evaluator recommends that future programs continue to use university pre-service teachers as aides. Additionally, they can be used for tutoring, and other specific skill building.

At least four students in the program were identified (via the pre-assessments) as having some significant deficits in their concept development when it came to math or science. Times were established for these students to receive tutoring by the university preservice teachers. All of these students stayed with the program for the duration. The parents of these students commented to the teachers and administration that this was the first time they had seen their children eager to learn, that they felt that their children were learning, and that they had developed a new understanding that their children were capable to learn. The new relationships that these children formed with their parents, and with the learning process may well change their future progress in school.

Recommendation 8: *Future programs should continue the use of an administrative team for program development and implementation.*

This year the summer school used an administrative team approach to running the school. One team member, a math and science specialist, was in charge of overseeing curriculum development and implementation. One team member, a literacy specialist, was in charge of overseeing and coordinating the use of aides, pre-service teachers, guests, parent activities, literacy development, etc. One team member served as the principal/director and oversaw other

aspects of the summer school. This approach worked well. The evaluator recommends that future programs continue to use an administrative team approach to running the school.

However, there were also some concerns that emerged with this approach this year. Recognizing them and making arrangements should there be future problems is part of good planning. The director was new tot he team and unfortunately experienced a personal illness that prevented some needed work from being accomplished. The teachers did not have their supplies for the first day of class, and often reported that they did not have what was needed or ordered. Sometimes items were received just at the start of the event. Other times they were not received. This put a great deal of stress on the teachers ad on the administrative team. When one team member is not able to follow through, other team member need to be empowered to take over and help meet the program demands. In reviewing all of the written units, two did not get implemented. The teachers reported that this was specifically because they did not get the materials that they requested weeks in advance, and they could not afford to go purchase them at the last minute out of their own pockets.

It is likely that the director's personal illness, which over-extended the roles of the other administrative team members, and the lack of visits by the district administrators to the summer school events, is also part of the reason that the teachers reported that they felt a lack of total support from the district. They reported more problems with team members that were not handled by administration, and more reliance by the director on the team members for help. It should be noted that the director was new to summer school. It should also be noted that neither the director nor the secretary spoke Spanish. This often meant that teaching staff had to be called to the office to translate for parents, or to translate materials that were going home. The hiring of the secretary needs consideration so that Spanish-speaking needs are easily met.

Recommendation 9: *The materials used to solicit participation and for parent sign-up need further revision. A summer school brochure should be developed that explains the program, and the commitment required.*

Many students who were recommended for summer school did not show up at all. Almost 20% of the students left the program before it was finished, showing a lack of parental understanding about the commitment that is involved in the program. Many other parents walked in over the summer and tried to enroll their children. When the evaluator asked students why they were there, many students said that they were not doing well in school and summer school was supposed to help them do better. They did not understand the nature of the program or what the program was attempting to do. Revision of the participation agreement forms, the materials that explain the program, and development of a promotional brochure that explains the program should be done. This would not only benefit the students, but also the parent may think twice before taking students out early. Additionally, revised forms would mean that the teachers might get more information on incoming students, and thus be better able to meet their needs.

In conclusion, the Special Alternative Summer School Program was successful in Year Six. The data supports the notion that the students increased their literacy in math and science, that teachers engaged in professional development and innovative teaching, and that parents were provided opportunities to learn and receive materials to help them engage with their children. There are several recommendations made. An additional recommendation would be for the District to consider finding ways to continue to fund and expand this valuable program.

1998 Cicero Summer School Teacher Feedback

Dear Teacher:

As past of the summer school evaluation process, I need to get your feedback on specific elements of the summer school. I know that you have already put a great deal of time and effort into this summer. However, I do need you to take a couple more minutes and complete this form. If you get it done before the school is over, you can put it in my box at the summer school. Otherwise, I have enclosed an envelope for you to mail it to me. Your answers are anonymous and confidential. Only the compiled results will be shared in the final report. Please complete this before July 25, 1998. If you misplace the envelope, please mail this to Dr. Sharon McNeely, PO Box 34421, Chicago, IL 60634

1. Was this your first year teaching summer school through this grant?
   a) If not, how many years have you taught under this grant?
   b) Have you taught under other summer school programs for District #99?

2. You received inservices related to the summer school in the spring. Please tell me about:
   a) The notification process:
      1) Were you notified you were selected with enough time to build your schedule?
      2) What would you change about the notification process?

   b) The information you received about summer school:
      1) Did you receive enough information?
      2) Was it appropriate? Do you feel you used it?
      3) What would you change?

   c) The engaged learning training:
      1) Did you get enough time for this training?
      2) Was it appropriate?
      3) Do you feel you used it?
      4) What would you change?

   d) The team building time:
      1) Did you get enough time for team building?
      2) Was the time appropriate?
      3) Do you feel you used it?
      4) What would you change?

3. For the curriculum development process:
   a) Did you have enough time before summer school to meet with your team?
   b) Did you have enough time after summer school began to meet with your team?
   c) What changes would you recommend?

a) [illegible]
b) Did you have enough time for your [illegible]?
c) Did your committee work well together?
d) What changes would you recommend?

5. As a group, you had input to the letter sent to teachers for selection of summer school students.
   a) Were the students you received appropriate for the program?
   b) What changes would you recommend?

6. Part of the summer school process specifics that parents have access to training and help with learning more about math and science they can do at home. Please tell me about your involvement with parents:
   a) Did you have access to the parent aide? If so, did you use the aide?

   b) Did you reference the parent booklet with your students? If so, how?

   c) What connection to math and science did you make for each family night?

7. Please comment on any of these things you would like to, and add your own other comments at the end of this section.

a) Your room:

b) your teaching materials:

c) Your curriculum

d) the computers

e) Your curriculum team

f) the administration

g) Your students

h) the daily schedule

i) the use of classroom assistants

j) your committee

Please add any additional comments on the back. Thanks for your time in completing this feedback form.

SURVEY OF PARENT ASSISTANTS for District #99 Summer School Program: 1998

Dear Parent Assistant,
As part of the evaluation as to the effectiveness of the overall summer school program, and to make recommendations for the following year, I would appreciate it if you would take a moment to respond to the following items. Please don't worry about neatness and grammar. Please give me your honest opinions. Thanks.....Dr. Sharon McNeely

1. What are the things about the summer school program that made you want to work here?

2. What are the things about the summer school program that made it difficult to work here?

3. Please tell me two things you learned working in the program this summer.

4. What ways can we make the program better?

Please put this in the attached envelope and mail it to me at PO Box 34421, Chicago, IL 60634, OR put it in my mailbox at summer school if you completed this before the end of summer school. Thank you for all of your time and energy.